

SCAAC Meeting Summary and Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

A Combined Meeting with the National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability

March 19, 2004
First Floor Conference Room
Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky

Committee Members:

Margie T. Bradford	Eleanor Mills	Roxie R. Tempus
Kay Freeland	Henry Ormsby	J. Maynard Thomas, Vice- Chairman
Suzanne Guyer	Roger Pankratz	
Varetta D. Hurt	Robert Sexton	
Benny Lile, Chairman	Linda Sheffield	
Gary Mielcarek	H. M. Snodgrass	Three (3) Open Positions

SCAAC Agenda

	Agenda Items	Presenters
	Call to Order	Benny Lile
1.	Roll Call	Roger Ervin
2.	Approval of Minutes from January 16, 2004	Benny Lile
3.	703 KAR 5:040 – Issues Relating to A2 – A6 Schools	Scott Trimble
4.	USDOE LEP Flexibility	Scott Trimble
5.	Strategies to Review/Consider - Purpose of Assessment and Accountability – Spring 2007 and Beyond	Gene Wilhoit Scott Trimble

6.	Strategies to Review/Consider - Core Content for Assessment and Accountability – Spring 2007 and Beyond	Gene Wilhoit Scott Trimble
7.	Strategies to Review / Consider - Student Performance Standards – Spring 2007 and Beyond	Scott Trimble
8.	Writing Portfolio Subcommittee Report	Benny Lile
9.	Writing Portfolio Audit Update/Status	Scott Trimble
10.	Set Next Meeting Date	Benny Lile
Adjournment		

National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) members:

James Catterall, University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), NTAPAA chair;
 Suzanne Lane, University of Pittsburgh;
 Robert Linn, University of Colorado;
 David Miller, University of Florida;
 John Poggio, University of Kansas;
 Andy Porter, Vanderbilt University;

Presenters:

Cindy Owen, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education
 Scott Trimble, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education
 Gene Wilhoit, Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Education

In Attendance:

CTB McGraw-Hill: Tammy Bullock, Connie Valentine
 Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO): Gene Hoffman, Art Thacker, Andrea Sinclair
 Kentucky Department of Education: Jennifer Bernhard, Tricia Bronger, Roger Ervin, Linda France, Rina Gratz, Bill Insko, Starr Lewis, Joanmarie McGuire, Phyllis Shuttleworth, Robin Thompson, Robert Wetter
 Kentucky Education Association (KEA): Sharon Felty Comer
 Legislative Research Commission: Sandy Deaton
 Legislative Research Commission, Office of Education Accountability: Gerald Lunney, Marcia Seiler

Call to Order**Benny Lile**

Chairperson Benny Lile greeted members at 9:07 a.m. Benny advised that this is the first actual combined meeting of the School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council (SCAAC) and the National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA). This committee has met with a few individual members previously but never the committee. Benny Lile has talked with James Catterall and it has been agreed to follow the SCAAC agenda. Benny welcomes the NTAPAA members to weigh in at any given time or members of SCAAC to ask questions of the NTAPAA members.

At 10:00 a.m. the meeting will reconvene in the State Board Room as the current room is quite crowded.

1. Roll Call**Roger Ervin**

Benny Lile asked that in place of the regular roll call, each member of both committees introduce themselves. Following is a list of the twelve SCAAC members present which is a quorum:

Margie T. Bradford
Kay Freeland
Suzanne Guyer
Varetta D. Hurt

Benny Lile
Eleanor Mills
Roger Pankratz
Robert Sexton

Linda Sheffield
H. M. Snodgrass
Roxie R. Tempus
J. Maynard Thomas

2. Approval of Minutes from January 16, 2004 Meeting**Benny Lile**

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile presented to the committee members the meeting summary and minutes from the January 16, 2004 committee meeting and asked members to review them.

SCAAC MOTION

Robert Sexton made the motion that the minutes stand approved as presented. Kay Freeland seconded the motion. All members in favor of the motion as presented signified by saying aye (all members). All opposed say nay (none). The motion passed as presented.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile advised that all minutes of past SCAAC meetings are now available on the Kentucky Department of Education WEB site (www.education.gov.us).

4. USDOE LEP Flexibility

**Scott Trimble
and
Cindy Owen**

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that he would like to take the first three issues together combining the A2-A6 Schools, Limited English Proficient (LEP) and future design issues. Cindy Owen will provide the main presentation.

Cindy Owen indicated that there have been new No Child Left Behind (NCLB) guidelines from the U.S. Department of Education for students with disabilities. The new guidance for LEP students is effective for the 2003 – 2004 school year. The difference is for students that have enrolled in a United States school for the very first time. The students must be administered the English Language Proficiency exam, and the students must be administered the State required mathematics test. In Kentucky if the student enrolls at a grade level the mathematics assessment is given then the student will be tested and if not, then the English Language Proficiency test will be used. In 2006 there will be more grades that mathematics assessment is offered. The student may be administered the State reading assessment. This is optional for schools if they want to test the student. The students must count in the 95% participation rate. If the student is enrolled in a grade that the mathematics assessment is given then the student's participation is based on that grade level.

If the student is in their first year of enrollment in a US school and has been enrolled for a full academic year, they may be included in accountability. For determining Annual Measurable Objective the LEP subpopulation will consist of two sets of students. It will be all of the students that are identified as having Limited English Proficiency with the exception that if they have been enrolled for the first time in a U.S. school. Also we can reach back and get the performance of students who have exited LEP program in the last two years. The rationale for this was that there were lots of comments made that students who are in this subpopulation by definition are not proficient with English and when they no

longer have that difficulty they move out of that subpopulation. It is really hard to get a handle on progress that we are making with that subpopulation. In determining if a school or district meets Annual Measurable Objectives, one can use the performance of students that have exited. That is not true for the n-count. For that group you only have to count the students that are identified, and with the exception of having to be enrolled for the first time. What this means is that if you have 59 students identified for Limited English Proficiency and it does not represent 15% of the population, then the school/district does not have to say that they have one student who exited the program last year and they do not have to count the student and be accountable for that subpopulation.

In order to implement this new guidance, this has to be taken to Kentucky Board of Education and they have to approve it. Then Kentucky's workbook is amended and sent to the U.S. Department of Education that informs them that we do want to exercise this flexibility. An email has been sent to the districts from Commissioner Wilhoit outlining the options for schools and district.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills asked for a further explanation on when a school or district may decide on when the decision is made. Is the decision made before the test is taken? Is it a district wide decision or is it school by school or student by student?

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen responded that the Department of Education is saying that it is a school decision and the decision is made prior to testing.

Scott Trimble added that schools should make their decision in conjunction with the district. The Department is willing to assist in negotiations if the school and district are at an impasse on the decision.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked about communication of the new procedures to schools and districts providing information how to code these students.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen advised that this is underway.

Roger Ervin indicated that technical decisions have been agreed upon on how to code the student test booklets. Development of user documentation is under way and that the Office of Assessment and Accountability will be communicating this to schools and districts very shortly.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked if official action is required from these committees on this?

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen responded in the affirmative. When this is presented to the State Board they will want to know the committee's stance on this. A recommendation from both committees is desirable.

SCAAC MOTION

Eleanor Mills made the motion to approve as presented that Kentucky State Board of Education implement the new U.S. Department of Education Limited English Proficiency guidelines. Margie Bradford seconded the motion. All members in favor of the motion as presented signified by saying aye (all members). All opposed say nay (none). The motion passed as presented.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall asked the NTAPAA members for the same motion for approval. The members voted with all NTAPAA members responding by saying aye. The motion passed.

3. 703 KAR 5:040 – Issues Relating to A2 – A6 Schools

**Scott Trimble
and
Cindy Owen**

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen reminded members that the committees and the Department of Education have been dealing with the issues of the A2 – A6 schools for many years. The regulation will be part of the April State Board meeting and will have a second review. The purpose is to figure out how A1 schools are held accountable and how A3 - A6 programs are included in the accountability. A1 schools are schools that have regular programs. A2 schools are vocational schools and there are not accountability issues with these schools as these students are also enrolled in A1 schools. A4 schools are pre-schools and for accountability there are no issues. A3 schools are special education programs, A5 schools are alternative schools, and A6 are day treatment centers.

Recommendations going forward in the regulation will continue to hold A1 schools accountable for students the A1 school or the district has placed. It would permit students placed in alternative programs to be attributed to the district accountability when districts place students directly into alternative settings with normal consultation with the judicial courts. Students placed in alternative educational settings made by authorities not directly under the control of the public school system will be attributable to a state level

accountability system if the students have not been enrolled in an A1 school or district for a full academic year. The regulation will permit the establishment of programs operating alternative environments in what are called final programs of placement and for accountability purposes that have programs like A1 schools. At least one district, and there may be others, say that they have schools currently classified as non-A1 school that should be treated as an A1 school. When students are sent to the alternative setting there is not intention to transition the students back to a regular A1 school. The school has a large enough number of students, has a stable population and this is how we operate and should allow for the school to be treated as if it were an A1 school. This does not mean that the Department will force any A3, A5 or A6 program to become a final school of placement. This would be a district decision. There will have to be at least 10 students at the accountability grade and 60 students combined grade for accountability.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland confirmed that this would be a district decision and that the criminal court system could not say that this is a final school of placement.

Benny Lile asked how it will be handled in a long term setting. Is this a determination made on a year to year basis or will the determination be made and stand until the Department hears otherwise? Also districts can not pick and choose students, the process will apply to all students.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen responded that down the road when a program no longer meets the criteria of a final school of placement and does not meet the 10 students per grade and 60 students in combined grades that the Department will transition the students back to a traditional program. The Department will discuss with the district how to transition the students back into district's traditional programs. Cindy Owen also agreed the process will apply to all students in the district. The aggregate scores of students placed in the programs through adjudication, e.g. any authority other than an A1 school or district, will roll up into state level calculations with a process in place to assure review of services to the students in a formal report to the Kentucky Board of Education. Within four months of the reporting of results a formal report is made to the State Board and the Commissioner of Education by a committee put together that is representative of these facilities, Department of Juvenile Justice, Social Services, Kentucky Department of Education, all the people that can make a difference in the programs that are being offered. The committee will explain what is happening with the programs and also make recommendations on how to modify and improve the programs.

Cindy Owen indicated that there is another piece that is not in the regulation but the committee has previously talked about. There is a requirement to create an accountability model that would fit these programs. The development of the model started in the Office of Assessment and Accountability and that work has moved into the Offices of Kyna Koch and Angela Wilkins.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked the committee for a motion in support of these changes to the regulation

SCAAC MOTION

Kay Freeland made the motion to approve as presented the changes to the regulation 703 KAR 5:040 relating to A2 –A6 Schools. H. M. Snodgrass seconded the motion. All members in favor of the motion as presented signified by saying aye (all members). All opposed say nay (none). The motion carries as presented.

NTAPPA member comments:

James Catterall applauded the system of backing these students into their districts rather than using test scores to evaluate schools that have a lot of turnover. This is a problem in California and this regulation will solve an important problem for Kentucky schools. James Catterall does not see a closing of the accountability loop for the State designated schools so their information goes to a committee that reports to the Kentucky Board of Education or the Commissioner. Who has the authority to go back to those schools and say you are not doing your job and you have to do this or you need to that.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen responded that this is something that will have to be part of the proposed accountability model that is developed. Decisions on actions to be taken will have to be a joint decision between the district and the other authorities that control the program in the facility.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass illustrated the situation with a day treatment program. The Department of Juvenile Justice and other agencies have very strict criteria in terms of programming. Every school district would love to change some of that but we can not as it would jeopardize funding and jeopardize a lot of other things. This is an avenue to have a joint resolution to what changes need to be made to help improve the educational environment for students. That loop has not been closed yet but the process is in place to address that. H. M. Snodgrass believes that the State Board will ultimately be making that decision.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble pointed out that the results for these schools/programs has been very flat and that bringing this to the State Board level will bring focus on this population.

OEA staff comments:

Marcia Seiler asked if the non A1 schools get a school report card?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that a school report card can not be produced because the student level data is less than 10 students.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass advised that typically the majority of these student results track back to A1 schools even though the programming in those situations is not consistent with the programming in A1 schools.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall asked the NTAPAA members if they endorsed the changes to the regulation as presented. The members voted and all responded with an aye.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked for a clarification that this regulation will not be in force for the Spring 2004 administration of the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen advised that if everything goes smoothly through the approval process the regulation will be in effect for the Spring 2005 test administration.

5.	Strategies to Review/Consider - Purpose of Assessment and Accountability – Spring 2007 and Beyond	Scott Trimble and Cindy Owen
----	--	---

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen advised that it is time to call a timeout, regroup and see if we are performing the way we want to and are there changes needed to make sure we reach proficiency by 2014. Presently one of the toughest questions is Kentucky's current assessment and accountability design making a maximum contribution to the kind of instruction needed for students to reach proficiency. Ten years ago we thought we answered that question but lots of things have changed since then. The goal of the education reform as it has been carried from 1990 through the changes in 1998 and what we are operating with now is to focus on instructional and assessment requirements for getting each school to 100 by 2014 and the No Child Left Behind act of 2001 (NCLB) has shifted that a bit.

A current review of our design which falls under CATS, the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System are the Kentucky Core Content Test, the Norm Reference Test, the Writing Portfolio, the Alternate Portfolio, and nonacademic data collected. We need to ask the question are these the right kind of assessments now. Schools and districts are held accountable using their own growth charts and the progress they make towards the goal of

100 by 2014. Is this still the purpose that we need to hold onto? From that purpose we created a set of tools, our content standards, our student performance standards, and our test blueprint. Are these the right tools? Do we need more tools? We have a number of reports produced from this. Are we meeting the purpose? Lots of people have been questioning it and they have tried to consider the strengths of the system that we have. Cindy Owen outlined a number of the strengths including content and student performance standards which have been established with huge teacher input. At the school level the assessment covers the breadth of the core content. At the school and district level there is content specific evaluation data and content specific subpopulation data.

We do have weaknesses. The slow turnaround time is making things more difficult every year. The lack of individual student diagnostic data and knowing where to go with individuals based on this assessment. The unintended instructional consequences is questions where schools and districts question offering Science at grade 8 since students are not tested in this content area at this grade level. Inappropriate rewrites of the Writing Portfolio where teachers have shared that students have rewritten their portfolios 49 times. These are not things that were meant to happen. There is no direct student accountability and everyone is saying that something must be done about that. Not all classrooms reflect an integration of assessment and instruction that everyone thought would happen by now.

Some of the improvements being explored are involving teachers in the scoring process of the Kentucky Core Content Test, creating snapshot assessments through out the year that would be available to teachers and they could use it in a capacity that they feel is appropriate that would provide the diagnostic data. Create some end of course examinations for students with the intent that when they took the exams it would not be the intent that they could not pass onto the next level but it would be to say what kind of supports do you need as you move forward. There needs to be some level of student accountability on CATS and we have heard many ways that might be accomplished. We need to utilize technology more efficiently. We have had many conversations of the need for students to demonstrate their knowledge of technology and perform using that technology. We need the students taking the tests on computers. Explore ways that available student data can be used to impact classroom instruction and school planning process.

To complete the review much input will be needed from a variety of groups and individuals throughout the Commonwealth. There are advisors and stakeholders who need to contribute on instruction and assessment.

Cindy Owen presented the points schematic and the goal is to know what our future purpose is. To accomplish this the schematic needs to be filled out. Once the purpose is defined then we need to talk about what tools are needed to make it happen. What kind of reports are needed to help people know if we are fulfilling the purpose?

SCAAC member comments:

Roger Pankratz feels that this is a good way to go. There is one fundamental thing that has to be looked at. When you deal with CATS, it is the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System, when you look at the technical group it is the assessment and accountability, when you look at SCAAC it is curriculum, assessment and accountability. Are we looking at this as a total package that links or are we just trying to infuse all of the changes from that end? There is a reason that curriculum was put on there, it is to make that link.

Roger Pankratz thinks the next link in teaching and learning is starting with standards, you go to assessment, and then to curriculum. The reason we are having such trouble in our teacher education programs in the past is that we started with a curriculum-based system. You start with a curriculum, eventually you might build some tests, and you only go to standards if you are required to cross-walk them. You turn this process all around with standards-based. Most of our people that are teaching in teacher education programs and particularly in higher education also are unfamiliar with a standards-based process. We never start with standards, we always start with a syllabus, we make off the test after we have taught for a while, and never pay any attention to standards. We have schools in the state that have learned to use data on assessment to inform curriculum development. Those schools are very successful and are doing fine. The ones that have not learned to do that are not. We are not teaching our new graduates and our new school leaders in standards based in the system. The CATS system has tremendous progress in data available to schools. What we do not have is more universal use of that data not only for the schools that are not being successful but for our teacher candidates, our school leader candidates, and so on, to use that data in a much more productive way. Eventually it will get to curriculum. There is a tremendous amount of data that is not being used because people do not know how to do that.

When we started out in KERA we said if we put in place an accountability system and put the standards out, people will find a way to get there. Some people have, but then we found out that was not enough. There were a lot of people that you could threaten their careers but they still can not do it because they do not know how. A real cutting edge point is to help the folks in all of the schools to use the data that CATS already has and tap into the use of those folks in the state that are highly successful. Unfortunately, most are not in higher education but are in the schools. We need to tap into that and say how do you use the data we now have to inform instruction in a better way. That is cutting edge. That is not an assessment issue but an instructional issue. How do you get our new teachers and the experienced teachers in rank 1, rank 2 and rank 3 programs as well as our school leaders to use data to inform instruction.

Benny Lile advised that the work of this committee should not just be assessment and accountability, it needs to include activities with the core content, and the program of studies. It is going to be very difficult to separate that discussion as this project moves forward.

OEA staff comments:

Jerry Lunney made the observation that there is a difference between curriculum and instruction. Assessment has had profound impact on curriculum but he has not seen much evidence that it has made any difference in the way people teach. He has not seen any body of work that says this is what you are supposed to teach and these are some good ways to teach it. He is not sure the assessment itself is going to do it.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked James Catterall to share the discussions that NTAPAA has had about transcripts, expand on our discussion, and to summarize anything else that the committee would like to catch SCAAC up on.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall advised that he and all of his NTAPAA colleagues agree that the kind of review is a good time to raise those questions and explore them. The motivations for a call for exploration is coming from two directions. NTAPAA has spent its energies over the six and one half years monitoring the quality and technical soundness of various pieces that have become part of the system, making suggestions from time to time insuring the validity of the system for purposes that is designed to serve. We do not see a challenge to CATS per say in terms of its validity in the dimensions that NTAPAA has looked at. The propelling and inquiry about the Kentucky testing system based on some very important questions doesn't really influence curriculum. Particularly asking the question around do you want student level information from the system is real important. That seems to be a desire on the part of educators, parents, and various folks along the way. The system going back to 1992 was originally designed as a school accountability and not necessarily a student level assessment. If the winds have changed, and Kentucky wants student level assessments, then going through the very questions that Cindy Owen has outlined is a good way to build up a model that perhaps does some things that are different than what CATS is doing and has been testing for.

Robert Linn indicated that NTAPAA was not unanimous on having student results on transcripts. The current CATS test has six forms with different students taking different parts of the test to cover the main core content. There is not a transfer, a retaking the test like the ACT. It is not known what purposes schools may have in mind for putting the scores on transcripts. The way you think about validity is not something that is attached to the instrument but is something about supporting the particular use or interpretation of results. There have not been validity studies that look at the uses as the uses have not been specified.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas asked that if we were on task of getting to proficiency by 2014 would we have this discussion of shifting from school based accountability to a student based accountability? Concerned that if we are not getting there then is the shift in thought saying that it is the student's fault rather than the schools fault?

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall responded that school accountability and student accountability are not necessarily inconsistent. It is a question of what information the system generates and its probably more of a question of cost and testing time than other things. NTAPAA is not hearing a desire to move to a student accountability system and away from a school accountability system. It sounds like adding some student accountability to the existing system.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas is concerned that not all students are getting the same instruction and therefore he does not see how you can hold those students accountable for something they may not be getting. When he looks at the various gaps in achievement and looks at the flexibility and changes in schools where you have a number of poor students in one school doing well, a bunch of poor students in another school not doing well. Something is wrong and he does not believe you can necessarily say that it is the student's fault and hold them accountable.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall totally agrees. There is a semantic issue in that student accountability may not be the right term. Student level usable information that does not penalize schools, that does not penalize children, it allows teachers to understand what children are do and don't know on a individual basis, and allows the planning of instruction. Student level information of that type is different than from student level accountability.

Robert Linn added that if you look at high stakes student level accountability such as grade level promotion or even more so high school diploma. One of the characteristics that is essential in such programs is that the student gets multiple opportunities to take the test. Robert Linn is not proposing that Kentucky move in that direction as he is not a fan. If you want to go in that direction, that is one of the design features that you have to change to be legally defensible, not to say just caring.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton asked if there is evidence that student level data promotes better instruction?

NTAPAA member comments:

Suzanne Lane advised that it depends on what other support systems that surround the assessment system in terms of professional development, in terms of meaningful classroom assessments and training teachers in using and implementing meaningful classroom assessments and being able to do something with the data. You can not say that student level data promotes better instruction because the other systems must be in place.

Robert Linn felt that there is evidence near the end of KIRIS, while not current evidence and how CATS is now, but there is enough similarities that generalizations would be

reasonable. The research would suggest that schools that give it, so to speak, find ways to use it that are constructive. However, not all schools or teachers get it. So if you happen to be in a school that doesn't get it, is it fair to that student to be held to the same accountability standards as a comparable student in a school where they do get it.

Andy Porter pointed out that a couple of the questions asked really high light some of the major issues. Is student level data going to help improve instruction? It may be useful to parse that in different ways that how it might help improve instruction and how it might not help do that. Will this help serve as a motivation to students as there is this play between school accountability and student accountability. When they are talking about school accountability they are talking about motivating schools, teachers and administrators. When they talk about student accountability they are sometimes thinking about motivating students. An observation, the vast majority of students when achievement comes about usually because schools are doing well by those students and the students are also trying. When education is really working, both sides roll up their sleeves and get together and try to produce results. When you have bad education, it hard for the bulk of students to do really well. At the same time it is very difficult for the school to do well when students do not try. This is one reason that it might be wise to have a system with some symmetry in it in terms of accountability.

You may be in a situation where some of the schools are not delivering and students do not have the opportunity to learn. One half is motivation which becomes very complicated.

Andy Porter continued with the second issue and that is information at the student level could be useful in a diagnostic sense. The same can be said for diagnostic information at the school level. How much diagnostic information is there in these assessments? Could there be more, is something that has to be on the list of considerations. On the diagnostic side, the school level maybe very helpful and on the student level for most teachers it is pretty hard to come in once a year and have a test that provides enough information that replaces what the teacher ought to know. Diagnostic testing systems are frequently extremely expensive and extremely time consuming. Andy Porter recommends that Kentucky not move full bore into student diagnostic testing.

John Poggio added that if the data does not go back speedily it cannot be of much consequence. If you are testing in March or April and don't start to see results of any usable form to drive instruction to assist in change. If data is not available until October, you have set up a situation that is just destitute to failure. Less at the school level but a school is waiting intolerable amounts of time. When KERA was started it was a system that was assessment driven reform based on a reward structure which no longer exists. You have a program going forward without the promise of reward for performance. What is left is what sounds like a high stakes program but really does not have any stakes. With the rewards gone for schools, what you now have is a program that really mis-labels itself.

James Catterall pointed out that the downside of consequences is still there.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile added that to the time issue there is also the subject issue. Receiving 4th grade student science information back in the fall will not assist the student as the next time the student takes the science test is in 7th grade at the middle school.

At 10:09 a.m. the committee began a morning break. Because of the number of committee members present and the size of the audience the meeting was relocated to the State Board Room. The meeting was reconvened at 10:33 a.m.

SCAAC member comments:

Margie Bradford feels that student accountability does not play a role at the high school. It is a school accountability issue. Bardstown Independent requires high school students to complete and have a passing grade on their CATS tests and that will count at graduation. The carrot is that if they get a good grade, they do not have to take finals.

Margie Bradford had another observation on what should be happening. The standards based classroom process as presented by Commissioner Wilhoit at the last meeting is a very good start. The concept paper has good ideas.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble reminded members that while the reward money is gone, there is still the assistance component. One should not underestimate the influence of public accountability and will cause people to react in school systems. Our contractual arrangement is through 2006. However with needed decisions, approvals and review time it is not too early to about the assessment program for 2007.

Gene Wilhoit adds that we are going to modify the program, this is a very aggressive schedule and a very short timeline for all of this to happen. Very immediate conversations need to occur.

Scott Trimble outlined the approximate schedule of dates. The basic elements that need to happen are to have a State Board approval of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the 2007 assessment towards end of February 2005. The RFP would require state approval and be worked through Finance. We would hope to issue the RFP in the March/April 2005 time zone. Evaluation of the responses would hopefully occur in the October 2005 time period. This will permit the Department to put together a budget for the 2006 General Assembly. This will allow us to have a contract in place to do a transition from where we are right now and where we want to be in 2007.

Gene Wilhoit added that there is a schedule of State Board conversions between now and September around some of these issues. The thinking of the research community and the curriculum, assessment and accountability community will be solicited between now and this fall as we stage conversations prior to each board meeting. Marcia Seiler {Legislative Research Commission, Office of Education Accountability} will conduct a study of the testing system. The legislature is requesting seven very broad questions about the accountability system. The study will happen between now and September.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked what is the scope of work and literal what are the next steps to be accomplished in that timeline. There may be a number of decisions this body needs to make. Obviously there should be a priority and we need to get that well defined. Benny Lile asked if this should be a priority for this committee at this time?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that one of the objectives of today is to begin the conversation of about where we are today and then where we need to go in broad terms. We should attempt to settle what the purpose is today. Are we committed to School Accountability system with coverage of the core content similar to the way our current system does that? Do we believe that for our schools and students to get to proficient performance that we need a different type of assessment system that perhaps yields more diagnostic information that will incorporate some kind of student accountability. That kind of discussion begins today. What kind of tools do we need which leads us to discussions about core content, performance standards, other tools. The test blueprint will be a critical discussion which will lead into curricular issues. The purpose will also define the kind of uses we want to make of this assessment system, the purpose of getting schools to 100 and the issues on continuing the current trend line.

SCAAC member comments:

Roger Pankratz feels that there has to be some report on effectiveness of CATS on the system that we have. What he gathers from people and politicians that are questioning the CATS, is that it is not working for everyone, therefore we ought to have a solution. One of those solutions we have heard is to utilize end of course tests. There is also a cost factor, is it too expensive. The assessment system for some schools is working quite well and for others it is not. Do we have any data, any information based on our experience to say that it is working for some schools and here is why. It is not working for other schools and here is why not. It is nice to have more information on student level. The only question is that when you add that across the system it costs money to do that. We only have so many dollars, so do we want to take money away from the school accountability system and put it on the student system. Do we have any data that shows that is a good move?

Roger Pankratz does not believe we have any data that shows that it is a good move. He does not believe that is a good move. There are a lot of people that have never liked KIRIS and do not like CATS and they are always going to want something different. Unless we can have some information about the success of the system that we have which is definitely

working for some schools. If people can use school accountability data, they probably can use student data too. If they are not using school data they probably will not use student data either. We need to explain what are we getting for the dollar we are spending. He believes we are but he does not think it is in a form that the public understands. It is incumbent on all of us to get that out there in some format that people can understand what the issues are.

NTAPAA member comments:

Andy Porter points out that as Kentucky moves forward focusing on what to do with the assessment and accountability program it ask that narrow question in broader framework of your entire instructional system. Kentucky is in a standards based reform system, everyone else is as well, that starts with content standards. In many ways that is the single most important component of the instructional system. The achilles heal of standards based performance is probably content standards. Our curriculum is a mile wide and an inch deep. You need to have a focus on some important and manageable content. The standards do not do a good job on that as they are not an analytic document in their own right. It is very hard to tell what is excluded. If you buy into a new assessment system you have to buy into changing your content standards. You have to think about them at the same time. With the breadth of Kentucky's assessment it has to be brought up to be comprehensive and aligned to the content standards. Standards tend to be so broad that it is expensive to mount an assessment with that kind of breadth. Secondly, it is difficult to have a very specific assessment that will effect the students when you have a very broad program. Some of the tools that you might think about are tools of an instruction guidance system as much as or more than they are tools of an assessment and accountability program. Nationwide, not just in Kentucky, the pressure is to include everything. People feel very uncomfortable when you say you are not going to do something, that means you have to do everything at a superficial level. Teachers are saying that they are teaching for exposure which it means you are teaching it for student learning.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland asked how much is on the table here? Are we able, are we allowed to make suggestions that we just do reading, mathematics, science, and social studies. When we look at assessment in 2007 can we narrow the field instead of trying to do everything? For example could we abolish the writing portfolio at the 4th grade?

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit advises that we have legislative guidance like including arts and humanities. How one assesses that is open for development.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asks if assessment and accountability always go hand in hand or is that spelled out again legislatively. Can we assess in a content area and not necessarily tie accountability to that content area?

Roger Pankratz provided a history of school performance standards starting from 1989. There was an intent at the very beginning to say less is more. But we never got there.

Benny Lile pointed out that much of what we have heard is in Commissioners paper that was reviewed two months ago. How do we choose which of those concepts to tackle first and what do they look like, what do they become for the next generation of assessments.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit agrees that this conversation around content standards is critical. If we took an honest appraisal of our current content standards we would have to say that there are lots of concepts to be taught, a lot of knowledge, a lot of skills listed in each of those. There is not the intellectual rigor in terms of separating those concepts in terms of importance. They are treated almost as if everything is equal. A teacher left with that kind of broad document is left with the solution of teaching everything. You go through a process and most of those concepts that appear there is of some value in looking at a discipline and dividing it into manageable units of study and surfacing the critical elements that are taught in sequence. This is a good opportunity for us to do so and to not do that as part of this process will mean perpetuating a great deal of frustration out there. We have gone through several reviews of core content, probably the most elaborate process anyone has ever had.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield felt that we have a start when we looked at core content in 3rd grade mathematics. We know that 11th grade mathematics core content does not match the program studies.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit indicated that higher level cognitive ability is extremely important, and something this state has attempted to hold onto. If we are careful about including that, those descriptors in the revised document, then it helps our assessment development process.

NTAPAA member comments:

Suzanne Lane in thinking about the purpose of the assessment and accountability if you provide school level accountability you want to provide meaningful student level scores that are instructionally sensitive. Suzanne Lane would hate to see Kentucky going the direction of moving away from constructed response items because of cost. Constructed response items on the assessment does have an impact on the nature of the instructional activities.

Robert Linn added that one might consider bringing in some experts to help focus as the task is very difficult.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas is confused about the purpose of the assessment. According to the document it is to inform instruction all schools can reach 100 by 2014. He thought that position had changed and we are now looking more at getting students to 100 and not necessarily schools.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit indicated that the clear purpose of the system is to hold adults accountable by school unit for educating all children and measure of school accountability has been 100. We have always worked on the premise that this is primarily a school accountability system. But other individuals have assumed that same system can do other kinds of things as we learn more. People are becoming impatient, rightfully so, and are asking more of the accountability system than simply measuring school accountability. We are getting tremendous pressure to hold students accountable for learning which creates an interesting dilemma for the technical people. Can you design a single instrument that will allow us to measure school growth over time, continuous progress at acceptable levels, at the same time provide enough information that we can make judgments about individual student performance. We have tacked legislation on over the last few years that has pushed us, rightfully, to pay more attention to those individual students.

Gene Wilhoit thinks that we are at a point where we need a school accountability system that provides as valid and reliable feedback on student accountability as we can get in the Commonwealth to the degree that information can be used for making judgments about students. There are technical questions of can it be done. Technical people here will say that it can be done but you are going to give up certain things and there are implications for instructional design in terms of results of the information that comes out. The harsh reality in this state and every other state it is not enough to have a system that measures only school accountability. That is the message that is coming through loud and clear.

NTAPAA member comments:

David Miller is unclear on student accountability and student data and used for what. He is more clear on where we have gone and where we are going with the school data and the kinds of uses and kinds of things that we are going to do with that what we are going to do with that student data are going to have a huge impact on the way you plan that program. That is the conversation he keeps hearing bits and pieces of but in some way he feels that the first thing is what kind of things do they want to do with this student data. It is not clear to David Miller that we will be able to come up with any answer about an assessment program until we talk about the purposes of that.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit has a sense that the policy leaders in this state do not want to take it to the ultimate student accountability level, that is promotional and graduation decisions about children. They are more interested in schools and districts being able to use that information to make decisions about adjustments in curriculum and instructional processes for children.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile added that from the field the two issues that he hears more often than any are diagnostic ability to take the data and do something with it. The other is growth. Did I as a teacher have an impact on this child and is there some data that demonstrates that there is an increase in achievement for this student?

Kay Freeland feels that there is another piece of accountability. If you have dealt with high school students recently you realize that it does not take them long to figure out that if they are not being held accountable for something they might not put their best effort into it. For example if they do not like a specific teacher they will blow that content area on the test. That is another piece of accountability in holding their feet to the fire so they perform well. Kay Freeland's district puts the scores on the transcripts last year. Our scores rose at the high school level 13 points last year. Kay Freeland is not hearing passing or failing, it is some way to make especially your high school students feel the need for accountability and do well on the exam.

H. M. Snodgrass feels that if we are spending 10 million dollars for the test you need to be able to give useable data other than just an index to punish people. The other element that is critical for the accountability system is a longitudinal component which the legislation called for in the beginning. If you want true accountability you will gage the growth in a cohort of students across time versus gagging different students each year. You can do a better job of what is happening in the curriculum and the growth of students.

Maynard Thomas talked about a built in accountability system where teachers measure students performance on a daily basis. The problem with accountability is that we are still having social promotions even though we know that those students are not doing very well in those particular subjects. What is the right thing to do?

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio feels that we have not discussed instruction. What we are hearing is that teachers are asking for help. Faculty in poor performing schools have tried, and what they are saying is tell me how to teach. Here is a skill, I have tried it and it didn't work. You give them data back and it says that you are low in this skill. What are they going to do. They are going to go back and do it the same way and probably try harder and probably will not have the resources. As we begin to consider purpose, should it be driven by accountability or should it be driven by instruction. A lot of the marks are continuing to focus on the accountability side but how do you change the system so that someone experiencing less than success knows what to do tomorrow morning and it is not repeating what it is that you have been doing. Does the system have to broaden itself to truly address instruction so that if I get data there is a book that I can go to that provides lesson plans that really work at this grade. That is where this needs to go. The answer is instruction, not a better mouse trap.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills advises that in her district test scores drive school planning. However, the test data does not provide the information that schools need for improvement.

Benny Lile added that there are so many complex issues affecting classroom instruction. It is not just student motivation. There are personnel issues, there are adult motivation and many other issues. Benny Lile is not convinced that the assessment can deal with all the other issues.

Roger Pankratz pointed out that we shouldn't ask CATS or some system to do things that it can't do. The question that we have raised, is how should we fine tune the system? Don't think we can change the CATS system and take care of all of the other problems. Don't change the assessment and accountability system to do things that it can't do.

Benny Lile adds that the question may be what can CATS indicate as opposed to what it can fix.

At 11:50 a.m. the committee adjourned for lunch.

The meeting was reconvened at 12:35 a.m.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile reconvened the group and dealt with some house keeping items that were not covered in morning. Benny again thanked the technical panel.

Benny Lile provided an update on committee appointments. He has been in contact with Keith Hall who is in the Governor's Office of Boards and Appointments. Benny met with Keith about one month ago and as Benny understands it, SCAAC reappointments are coming up in April. Benny expressed the committee's concern about vacancies and his response is that all of the vacancies would be filled when all of the reappointments and new appointments occurred in April. SCAAC will have it's full complement sometime in April.

5.	Strategies to Review/Consider - Purpose of Assessment and Accountability – Spring 2007 and Beyond (continued)	Scott Trimble and Cindy Owen
----	--	-------------------------------------

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile felt that the discussion in the morning was extremely valuable and this discussion needs to continue. We need to bring closure to today's portion of this discussion. John Poggio and James Catterall have relayed to Scott Trimble that it might be beneficial to go around the table and informally each member could say one or two things they really like about the current system and perhaps one or two things you might like to see addressed that might lead to some changes. Then based on our complete discussion today, can NTAPAA address the question, can our current instrument begin to do the things that we are talking about. If not can it be flexible enough to begin to attempt to do some of those things.

Maynard Thomas had a thought that the purpose of our assessment from this point on should be to providing data that drives instruction that makes it possible for each student capable of reaching proficiency by 2014. The thought of just getting schools to proficiency should be out. There are poor kids, there are minority kids, there are students with special needs that are evidently not getting the same things that other students are getting. Focus should be on the students and not the schools.

Eleanor Mills began the conversation on what is liked about the current assessment and things that should be addressed. Assessment as we have it now gives us a good global umbrella to identify particular gaps. The weakness is that we cannot target skills. We can target areas but not skills. An area that should be addressed is writing and how we address writing at all levels. What is developmentally appropriate at the earlier levels and at the upper levels? How can we focus on writing that post secondary institutions, whether technical or academic and work force, echo the sentiments that we are producing students that can walk into those situations and be capable of functioning. For student accountability may not help

NTAPAA member comments:

Robert Linn indicated that one of the things he likes about the Kentucky system is that it is not just reading and mathematics. The system addresses other content areas. The writing portfolio, while not trouble free is a good thing because it does encourage writing which is a very important skill for children to develop. There is a fair amount of evidence that if you assess writing, then more time is spent writing in classroom which is a good thing. If you stay with broad content then stay with six (6) forms of the assessment instead of one (1) form.

David Miller likes the breadth, the multiple areas, and multiple forms. Coming from Florida, the other thing he likes is that Kentucky does not have high stakes individual results. Florida has all kinds of problems with retention requirements and students passing the high school graduation. The one improvement is setting up better ways of working with school systems on how to use the results better and to understand the results better.

Andy Porter when he thinks about an assessment and accountability program he has three (3) things he always thinks about: 1. What is the target for instruction? Is the assessment and accountability program driving instruction in a positive way? 2. Is it symmetric in terms of accountability and instruction? Historically states have tended to do one or the other. Andy is an advocate for both. 3. Is it fair? If you have school accountability is it fair to schools in providing resources so that they can be successful? Is it fair in a technical sense? Does it provide good numbers in reliability and validity?

Andy Porter likes the breadth of subjects. Testing just in reading and mathematics provides a too narrow focus. Andy likes the idea of using new forms of the test each year. When this is done a specific form does not become a target of instruction. Rather you have to step back and focus more on the domain that the multiple forms across years provide. A lot of states use the same form every year, that has a very bad affect. He likes the technical quality of the CATS test.

Andy Porter suggested that areas that one could look to for improvement is to improve content standards and continue to align the assessment program to those content standards. Improving the quality of the standards is always a good idea. However, the standards should not become more focused on a few global general statements. It would be shorter but not focused. He recommends that Kentucky move very carefully and gingerly toward a little bit more student accountability.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield feels one of the best things about the accountability index that we have is that we have a level higher than proficient. Moving towards proficiency for all students means that some children are moving down and that is a real danger. We need to look at all students moving ahead. We have to look at not just the gap between students. Do we really want no gap between a student with IQ 60 and with a student with an IQ 150. Linda would love to think that every single student, all the special education categories, etc., could do as much mathematics as a student who loves mathematics and has an IQ of 150. We need to think about the gap between the potential of those students and where they are actually achieving. Looking at curriculum, there is good mathematic curriculum available. There is research showing that the reform curriculum is causing students to get higher scores than with the traditional curriculum. There was no money for curriculum last year to buy new textbooks. She is not sure if the legislature is going to pass that this year.

Writing Portfolio good for writing but mathematics teachers say that we liked the things we had to write when it was a mathematics portfolio. It does not fit the standards in a writing portfolio. If we are going to write in our mathematics classes let us go back to writing the

kind of pieces that we wrote when they were in Math Portfolios. Recognizing the cost to develop items we still need to be able to release items on the existing test to broaden our pool and look at what higher level thinking on items mean.

Roxie Tempus likes having the assessment measure all the subject areas. Holding students and parents accountable has been a good thing. Competition between schools is doing good things to the academic needs of the students. Roxie would like to see the standards set higher. Students could be doing so much more but we do not expect so the students don't do it. This is a general statement as she recognizes many students are doing the best they can. She personally knows way too many students that could be distinguished and beyond instead of proficient and beyond. Schools are only interested in getting students to proficiency not assisting all students.

Margie Bradford feels that the assessment needs to be student driven. The top students are not being challenged while other students are being left behind. The CATS test provides a good cross section but it will never do everything people want it to do for the individual student. Her greatest fear is that there will be a leveling out where everyone is pulled towards the middle instead of raising everyone up.

Robert Sexton found it interesting that James Catterall's comment that perhaps we should stop using the term student accountability. One of the strengths he sees in Kentucky's system is that we have not gotten into this trap of fighting over how many children are going to move from the third grade to the fourth grade. As you look around the country that is a hugely important thing. On the other hand, the whole question of high school ought to be on the table. Even going to end of course examinations instead of what we currently have needs investigation. Might there be a way to suspend the whole high school accountability process for a given period of time and redo it. Part of the problem with change is going from one system to the next and at the high school level that may not be possible if we do the kind of things that would be worth doing. Robert feels that we have to deal with the public response and teacher response to high school motivation. Robert Sexton is not in favor of a graduation test.

Suzanne Guyer is experiencing positive things. She is seeing higher level thinking going on. She sees teachers working more to try to differentiate because we are recognizing students and their different levels of high order thinking. Assessment in many cases drives instruction and that is positive and teachers then know what to expect. Teachers know what is valuable and important. For example half of reading will be literary. It also impacts instruction negatively in that things that are not tested at a grade level are often not taught. 4th grade social studies and 5th grade science are two really key areas that instruction is not as rigorous as it should be. Suzanne has concerns about writing portfolio issue in that if you are in a school where all your scores are all in the 90's and 100's you cannot afford to have a writing portfolio score that is a 60 or 65. So you do spend a lot of time working with your writers.

Varetta Hurt agreed with everything she has heard. There are positives in the areas that we do test. She has a problem at grades where the content is not a targeted area, you do not have instruction and we suffer for it later on when it is addressed at a later grade. She also has a problem with the science scores. Why do students seem to test poor in science than they do necessarily in some of the other areas. She wonders about the writing portfolio as you can get a beautiful chocolate cake and it tastes awful when you eat the cake. There has been so much time spent in writing and there is no transfer in her Social Studies class. Is the portfolio truly a measure of student performance. What can we do to close the gap with assessment?

Kay Freeland feels that the assessment has helped us focus more on the curriculum. It has helped on instructional delivery, strategies, it has helped the high school get away from set and guest lectures. Kay feels the test is too broad based, has lead to inappropriate use of time and emphasis. At the high school level there is nothing really to hold the students feet to the fire to perform well.

H. M. Snodgrass agrees that the core content is too broad. We should concentrate on the four core areas and incorporate the other areas as much as possible. H. M. understands the problem with individual data is the lack of the number of test items. It might be worth considering increasing the number of items in the four core areas to get more valid individual student data. On the writing issue, he concurs with the others. He thinks his teachers and principals would concur with that as well. Last year they had a fourth grade girl that had so much anxiety about the writing component of the assessment that she rubbed poison oak on her face so that it would swell up and she would be sick and she did not have to take the test. Being the fully committed school district that they are, that every child will take the test, we made her take the test anyway. As far as being developmentally or cognitively appropriate for a child that age that has so much emphasis put on the writing, he feels that we are doing a disservice to our children. Cost is a consideration. The legislative policy makers are taking really seriously in the austere times that we are operating in from a financial standpoint. We should not jeopardize a system of accountability as this was not intent of his comments at all. It might be time to become more realistic about what is going on in schools and what you have to do get there. This turns out to be a process system rather than an academic teaching system. There is an awful lot of process and you cannot limit teachers. They are going to work on the portfolio, they are going to spend enormous amount of time dealing with process versus content. It is important that we have a legitimate external measure to gage on how our students are doing versus just looking at how they are progressing on our standards within the borders of Kentucky. It may be ACT, SAT or some other external measure that is a more global measure. Not that you have to compare the percentiles on individual students but from a group standpoint or from a total state standpoint it is important that we be able to get a good measure of whether we are really making progress on a statewide basis.

OEA staff comments:

Jerry Lunney as an employee of the Legislative Research Commission he is officially non-partisan. Because of the current actions of the legislature, he is neutral on this subject so he passes.

SCAAC member comments:

Roger Prankratz thinks the suggestions about CATS has been good and he is going to leave that to the people who are in the trenches. Roger has three suggestions and wants to make one comment. The three suggestions would be that the Department take this data and whatever the CATS does well ought to be put out there in a user friendly manner for people to look at. We ought to say here are things that CATS does well, the system has done well, and these are parts that we probably need to seriously keep because they are doing well. It is good to say what it should do or what we would like to see it do, but with what we would like to see changed, if there is costs associated that should be clear so that you have something you want done then you have to consider the cost if it is going to be changed. For items that are suggested to change one should provide what the downside to the change is.

Roger Prankratz commented that the Council of School Performance Standards met from March of 1989 to December 1989 just before KERA. The committee produced a report and Roger could not think of any recommendations that were not adopted by KERA except that the committee recommended two assessment systems. A state system for accountability of schools so no school would be left behind. They also recommended that every school system should have a student accountability system and the state and the Department should help local schools develop local student accountability systems. That was the one recommendation of that group that was never addressed.

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio reflects that the real strength of the Kentucky system is the genuine commitment to improvement in excellence. He doesn't know how you go forward and give that up. Somehow Kentucky needs to realize that in all these conversations it is always effort to get better and do it as best as you can. That is what provides the strength in the program, that ability to listen to each other, to disagree, never the less to go forward, and look in some other environments where pressure in large scale assessments exists. It is a matter of getting it done and planning is an very effective part of what happens, hitting the marks as it were for technical adequacy occurs but you are sort of left with the sense of you are just doing it to get by. They do not want some of these things discussed. John has been impressed with how well informed the different bodies are. The state through the Department, the schools and other agencies does an outstanding job no matter who you talk to they understand this program. He has the feeling if we were to discuss equating right now, everybody in this room would understand what we were talking about. That permeates groups like this, other groups, certainly people in the State Board of Education, members of the Department. This notion of fundamentally knowing your program is truly a pleasure for someone comes in and says folks really know what we are talking about here. A school administrator says I understand the issues of these items. Whether we agree or

disagree on how to resolve that problem is sort of recognize how informed the populace is here.

John Poggio feels that the shortcomings are the role of performance assessments in the state. He feels that you make a tremendous investment of resources, time and feature those things but you basically throw away the opportunity of performance assessments by bundling them up and sending them out of state for scoring. There has been ongoing discussion about using those devices for local scoring. It is the one topic he does not understand why things are not moving a little more quickly. If it is to benefit instruction it is not a matter of just keeping people focused on critical thinking and critical analysis through performance assessments, but allowing instructors to see the products of their students work beyond what is done with portfolios. He is surprised that in a state that is so forward looking in its plans, the limited reliance on technology as associated with the entire assessment enterprise. Delivering data and reports online, you are very committed to a paper world. He thinks this is changing, discussions have begun about computer based testing that can potentially resolve a lot of the issues.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas reiterated that his feelings on gifted and talented students and data driving instruction. We do not get any data that is specific in how children are identified as gifted. That is some data that is really pertinent to determining how we can move those children beyond proficiency.

Linda Sheffield added that she as president of the Kentucky Association for Gifted, has a number of requests from teachers and they are really appreciating that we can have disaggregated gifted. But because we identify them by different areas it is really difficult not having the five areas separated on the student test book or at least have a bubble for academic identification and one for nonacademic identification.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble added that it will be done when STI is in full operation. We would do it on the student test book but the page is full.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile thinks the mix of multiple choice, open response, constructed response is good and needs to be kept. The rest are amen's. Robert Sexton's comments about high school and totally reworking the high school assessment and Benny has a great interest in end of course exams. Benny indicated that subjects should be assessed every year or at least the four core subjects which gets away from the issues that Suzanne spoke about. Varetta probably put the writing issue as good as he has ever heard. The writing is extremely problematic to point of diminishing returns and he is wondering if that point has been reached.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall started with what he says to his California friends or people outside of Kentucky when they ask what are you doing there. James likes Kentucky's testing system. He likes the breadth and that it goes after multiple subjects. He likes the fact that human beings actually look at student work across various topics which sets Kentucky apart in many ways from lots of places. He has always thought of Kentucky as a pace setter on using performance based assessments, open response type items and doing it across the curriculum and multiple subjects. James really likes working with Kentuckians. He likes Kentucky, good people, it is always pleasant to be here.

James has some things he does not like. He does not like No Child Left Behind because of the convolutions the system has had to go through or is planning to go through to meld NCLB requirements into what was going on here. He views it as an unfortunate complication with any set of purposes that come with the future rendition of the test. NCLB obviously stretches resources beyond where Kentucky should stretch. It causes you to have single forms at a grade level or one or two open responses instead of six. It undermines some of the integrity and depth of the information collection and the breadth that Kentucky would have had.

James likes the fact that some subjects are tested only at certain grade levels. There is an efficiency. You have to think about why you and can't do everything all the time and it has been set up in a way that makes sense. We have had a lot of discussion here on whether this test drives instruction here or how it could or how it could do it better. That is an absolutely pivotal piece. If you want more learning you need better instruction. There are motivation components that you want to pay attention to as well. Does the system drive instruction by design, that is the way it is set up, the way information flows, does it have a chance of driving instruction. Two of the limitations that he sees are the kind of information? People would like to have information more targeted to a more specific sub content standard. We would like it earlier as the timing of information is not good for teachers wanting to plan instruction. There is a capacity issue. If someone is going to drive instruction, not only does it to bring information to people that is useful, but it has to have in place some support system around it that inclines that information to be used. Either the information is so desirable and good that you couldn't possibly not use it, or you need the right kinds of help or you need motivation or some combination of all those things. He has heard that some teachers jump right on it, just their thing. Others just leave it alone. That is a tough nut to crack, no matter where you go with this system. It is not just the kind of information, it is a systemic piece.

James Catterall has heard through out the day the need to have symmetry between schools and children. Student accountability has been one of the main themes and how could student motivation have an affect on student level results apart from not letting them graduate or not letting them move ahead. Students like to do well and being rewarded or acknowledged for doing well is something that is motivating. There might be ways to use student motivation in schools whether it is this years Dean's list or something like that which students would like to be on.

James Catterall has not formed strong opinions one way or the other on end of course examinations. In principle those kinds of things make some sense and working through ways that those kinds of exams could be part of school assessment. Or maybe we are shifting gears towards student accountability at the high school level. This is one part of rethinking high school.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile posed the question to the group. Can our current system begin to do the things that have been discussed around this table today? If so, what changes need to happen? This is to be taken in a general context today and not the final answer today.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall feels that Kentucky wants to maintain school accountability system with some sort of student accountability. The current structure, the testing, the school accountability piece, the NTAPAA panel has weighed in on the notion that the information that the CATS system generates is valid for the uses of assessing and looking at schools in comparative performance. Is the information instructionally sensitive, is it useful, is it done in a timely way? Certainly, there are things that can be improved. When we talk about a set of content standards that are more specific and more operational than the ones that are just generalized, will then improve the instructional sensitivity and improve the usefulness of the information to teachers? While not thoroughly informed about the support system behind what teachers are able to do with the information, your professional development network, what happens precisely because of the test? We certainly heard a lot today that more could be done in terms of supporting teachers interpretation of and use of information and instructional strategies to improve weaknesses.

On the student accountability side or the student assessment side, there are limited things that the test in its current design can do. We have had discussion of various things that student information might be and might not be valid for. The panel's general take on that is for certain things it is valid in conjunction with other information. For instances, the KEES scholarship NTAPAA would not suggest awarding on basis of CATS information, but we see no problem using CATS information along with GPA's and ACT scores to make those decisions. We would not use CATS information to trigger some sort of major effort to diagnose a student who was having trouble. The CATS information is quite valid when used along with a whole set of information to decide that a student may or may not need intervention of some sort. NTAPAA has discussed little in terms of direct student level information with the test and what it may or may not be good for. Different grade levels are better than others in covering content at the individual level. That is an issue that needs to be looked at in the context of using the test at any particular grade level and in any particular subject. The test has its limitations in those regards because it does not have infinite open response items, it does not have multiple choice items that necessarily cover the entire curriculum in a balanced way that you would like to. It goes pretty far in that direction in some subjects but not others. Any student information that would come out of the system as it is now designed would be kind of late. It would be in fall of the following

year and one could think of reasons why you might like to have it a little sooner than that. Particularly if you want to use the information to do anything with your present year students.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas asked the question, is there a consensus or a majority of the SCAAC members that believe that we should have student accountability on our assessment.

Benny Lile asked if we have distinctly defined student accountability? Also, some people confuse end of course exams with graduation exams.

Robert Sexton felt the committee has not defined student accountability.

Roxie Tempus has a problem in making a blanket statement in support of student accountability because there are students whose needs are not necessarily met by their teachers. This is a big discussion item and we have to define what it is first.

Robert Sexton is frustrated as he does not know how you can move forward by September without deciding something today. You framed the question for or against student accountability which is a totally different question than is student level data. We need to structure this so we can decide.

Kay Freeland added that is this diagnostic data and student motivation? When you talk about student accountability some people are thinking holding the student accountable for doing well, some people are thinking specific student diagnostics.

Benny Lile said that what he heard today was that we wanted an instrument that will provide more or stronger individual student data. How that data is used is perhaps a separate discussion. We want more student data from this system.

NTAPAA member comments:

David Miller does not want those things separated too far. Data validity has to do with what use you make of it. You must be clear in the use of the data.

John Poggio advises that you probably need to start attaching what you mean by consequences of student accountability. Is it a transcript, is it guidance that is expected to occur when scores are low? Does it move toward grade to grade promotion or high school graduation. If you stop and think about those things, now fitting it to the question about budget. What he knows is that the more accountability you demand of the test, the more expensive this program is going to become. Potentially dramatically so. Simple options like if it is to be accountability at the simplest level will you provide opportunity for retesting? That is a lot of money, a lot of management. The further out from there you go the more expensive things become. That is not to say that it is good or it is bad. If you associate a lot of attention to cost and how the money is being spent, is that how you want to be spending what might be diminishing resources?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble points out that you can think about student data in several categories. It might be diagnostic information at the next grade level. It might be for evaluation for further instruction intervention. It might be for the high score at end of course examination. It might be at the elementary and middle school levels for promotion / graduation.

SCAAC member comments:

Roger Pankratz advised that his understanding is that there is not a pot of more money. If you are going to talk about student assessment, you are going to take away from what we already have and divide it up. He is very much not in favor of considering student level data if it were a ploy to diminish school accountability. He strongly feels that any legislature is interested in spending more money on assessment in this state. If we go to another system we will have to take away from what we already have. He would be very cautious in what we take away from.

Eleanor Mills hears from teachers and administrators that student accountability is more so focused at the high school level. That is where the accountability issue is. Mainly the issue is at the 12th grade.

NTAPAA member comments:

Andy Porter reminds everyone that we have student level data now. We give that feedback to students and parents. If people are talking about having student level data, they are probably meaning better data to serve diagnostic purposes for instruction. He would recommend exploring a separate testing system. If you start where we are, there are so many constraints, you can not get to a good diagnostic assessment. The shortcomings are: this is a once a year system. There are not multiple measures. This is a standardized test and most good diagnostic assessments are not standardized.

James Catterall points out that technology has not been mentioned today. Were you to go to a new test providing diagnostic information could be built around computer based tests where they take them online, they process open response items online and get feedback directly online. This should be costed out and there are some economies to be had once you have this kind of testing up and running. The machines are doing the scoring instantaneously and displaying results.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas asked if there is any documentation and research supporting the idea that high school students are blowing off the test?

Kay Freeland responded that students who are scoring 27, 28, 29, 30 on ACT should not have a novice classification.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that score research shows 8% of the high school falling into this group. There is a much higher correlation of CATS scores and ACT scores.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas asked if it is a valid comparison between the ACT and the Kentucky Core Content Test as far as how well students are doing on ACT versus the SAT versus the CATS test knowing that scholarships rely upon the SAT college entrance and ACT?

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio advised that NTAPAA has looked at and have not studied extensively. NTAPAA's take is that not all students take the ACT, it is not required of all students. Already you are going to start to see some differences. The KCCT tests do a good job measuring the core content. The extent to which the ACT reflects that same core content is not going to be phenomenally great. You have tests measuring different things. There is a marginal relationship between KCCT performance and ACT performance. Not the kind of relationship that sells well politically. Recent reports continue to show reports and graphs of KCCT going up, ACT scores remaining flat. It is based on data under the old program and this program has changed in some rather significant ways. What we probably do not have at this point is the kind of study that really needs to be done. That is find students who have taken the state exam, scored well through effort and have concurrently taken the ACT and monitor that group over time to see as KCCT performance improves so might ACT performance. The proper study is yet to be done. There is a lot of anecdotal evidence.

Andy Porter feels that the ACT is not the panacea. Don't confuse CATS and ACT. CATS is a valid and reliable measure for what we want it to be. ACT is not the standard here.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland outlined what they do in her district to motivate high school students. They posted in every school all the students that got proficient or distinguished in all of the assessment area. They are posted in the hall and they stay up all year and the parents love it. They have also passed a local board policy that says every graduating senior must score at least apprentice on the writing portfolio. Two years ago there were 57 novice portfolios. There was no excuse for that except that the students didn't try. Last year there were only 2 novices and they went to summer school to remediate it.

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio points out that everyone might be best served if local school boards adopt that kind of policy instead of a state policy. When it is done locally, you know that you are going to deliver the instructional opportunity. If the state did it, you could all sit back and say well don't blame us, blame the state.

Gene Hoffman from HumRRO reminded members that there is a different motivation taking the CATS test and motivation on end of course tests. Each needs different solutions.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble asked that not for this meeting but for the next, the committee should reflect on a definition of purpose. We will get back with you on more specifics on diagnostic testing and will want to look at snapshot testing.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton pointed out that we have had this discussion before. It has been better today and more substantive. Robert feels that Scott Trimble as the representative of the Department will need to give this committee some decision making process. We repeated the presentation from this morning and it does flow into a logical sequence of time. We have not talked about the technology question and the scoring question. If we do not have a decision making process of the group, to make these decisions, and it has to be one meeting, he feels we will repeat this process. There are ways to sort this out to force us to talk about one thing and decide and the next thing and decide.

Benny Lile agreed that the committee needs a framework to operate within. We will be asked to make recommendations on technology, teacher scoring, standards and core content. These areas we need framed out and we need to understand what parameters we are operating within, a time line, what needs a decision, when is the decision needed. We need that by May.

The committee began a discussion of the Governor's appointments and reappointments as terms of many members expire at the end of April. Conversation centered around what the current committee could accomplish within the timeline and how best to transition new appointees in.

OEA staff comments:

Jerry Lunney is of the opinion that there will be a new SCAAC in May because of appointments. If you go into that meeting, are the minutes going to be sufficient for you to say this is what the old SCAAC said sufficient for the new group?

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland said that you are going to lose a lot of history with the possible member turnover.

Eleanor Mills recommended that the committee meet in mid April. She is also concerned about articulation and communication of the old members with new members.

Benny Lile wanted to know if the Department could create the framework in three weeks to allow us to do what we need to do.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble outlined a very tentative schedule on when different parts might go before the board and that the Department had not insight when members would be appointed to the committee.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills asked that a meeting in April be scheduled as well as one in May

Benny Lile polled members at it was agreed that the a tentative date of April 23 would best for most. Robert Sexton, Roger Pankratz, and Linda Sheffield advised that they are not available on that date.

The regular May meeting was scheduled for May 21. Margie Bradford and possibly Varetta Hurt may not be able to attend.

NTAPAA member comments:

The NTAPAA members advised that their panel would adjourn as part of the combined meeting. Most members had airline flights to catch. They found the combined meeting very worthwhile and thanked everyone for the opportunity to have the meeting.

At 2:24 p.m. the committee began a afternoon break.

The meeting was reconvened at 2:36 p.m.

8. Writing Portfolio Subcommittee Report

Benny Lile

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile introduced the Writing Portfolio Subcommittee consisting of Eleanor Mills, Suzanne Guyer and Roxie Tempus. Benny thanked them for the outstanding effort to date on this report.

Eleanor Mills said that they were given the opportunity to come together to discuss writing in its current state and some of the concerns that go with the writing process. Some of the concerns deal with stress, making sure writing is developmentally appropriate, and dealing

with voices from the secondary education world, post work, post secondary training schools, colleges and universities that have raised issues with the writing process. We have seen excellent writing. The committee consistently heard that writing is critical, writing is important, writing is something that needs to be kept. However, we heard the same recurring chorus is the amount of time spent on writing portfolio is a issue with the time spent and people are becoming frustrated.

Eleanor Mills referred members to the report that outlined the concerns and what should be addressed. The concerns ranged from technical writing at the high school level, costs, integration of writing are a few.

The committee started the development of a survey to input from the school level. They have tried to keep it short and simple. Eleanor gave an overview the survey. People are interested in the survey so that improvements can be made in writing.

Roger Pankratz made some suggestions on how to formulate the survey as everyone says writing is important and there is still something going wrong. Students say that the writing portfolio is not interesting.

Robert Sexton points out people have lost the love of writing and it might be worthwhile to have some questions to find out why some people enjoy writing.

Benny Lile had two students submit what could be considered electronic portfolios or perhaps professional portfolios. They had evidence of slide show they created, presentations they created, a great array of technical writing. All of that piece of work they basically did on their own. They were class projects and they had freedom of choice. Under the current system they might have been able to submit one of those pieces under one area. Could we devise a way for students who love to do those things to count. Their work was superlative, highly individual and highly specific to tastes, likes and desires. When he looked at their regular portfolios, they were ok but they looked like a million of other portfolios. Is there a way we can have this type of work submitted as a portfolio?

Roxie Tempus said that she is a strong advocate of writing but what she is seeing is that it is not the student's work. It is no longer the student's work when they write, then redo, redo and redo. By the time the teacher has them rewrite this piece 90 times it does not reflect the students she knew. She feels bad for the teachers that have to put so much time into it. What she feels is inappropriate is the amount of weight put on this part of the assessment that they take away her child's love for writing. She would like to see the portfolio pieces reflect what they have learned and for it to truly be student work.

Benny Lile summarized the frustration at the district level. He has done everything possible to stop teachers from having students excessively redo the portfolios. He admits that he has failed. He cannot stop it.

Kay Freeland said that the portfolio is the only thing that teachers have direct control over on the test.

H. M. Snodgrass feels that having students work on writing portfolios at the 4th grade is an inappropriate placement. The secondary level is the more appropriate place. The criteria for proficient and distinguished in the local district should be broadened to point to where it really is the student's work. You don't have some auditors come in and the student has done something novel and creative and they mark the performance level down to a novice. The emphasis should be on moving the students forward within the district without having arbitrary standards that absolutely cause the teachers to feel like they have to rewrite this thing and it is the teachers work when it is all said and done.

OEA staff comments:

Jerry Lunney has looked at the audit data over last two years and there is only one cell where there is more than 50 percent proficient or distinguished. All that work and they still are only coming up novice and apprentice.

SCAAC member comments:

Margie Bradford made the observation that good writing breeds from the ability to read. If children do not like to read and do not read proficiently a variety of things, they are not going to write well.

Kay Freeland feels reading is more important at the elementary level than the writing portfolio.

Varetta Hurt agrees but students must have exposure to writing. Teachers have focused so much effort on the final product and are leaving out the basics of writing skills. She also does not see any transfer of writing skills from one class to the next.

Roxie Tempus stated that her daughter is an excellent reader but she has never been instructed in the mechanics of writing.

Eleanor Mills ventured to say that reading skills have fallen at the elementary level because emphasis is placed on writing.

Benny Lile heard a speaker last summer make the comment that children are writing more than ever and they are. If you have a teenager at home you know what I am talking about, email and chat.

Eleanor Mills shared the frustration she is hearing at the upper level where emphases is placed on flowerily writing and students are not to express, summarize, analyze, and evaluate situations.

KDE staff comments:

Starr Lewis talked about improved writing instruction that appears in George Hilliach book "The Testing Trap". Percentage wise 87 percent of Kentucky teachers felt that the writing portfolio and the on-demand assessment had improved the instruction of writing. He did not ask them if it made them like the instruction of writing or if it had improved kids love of writing. The research was done at all different levels and they stayed with the those schools over time.

Scott Trimble made the suggestion that maybe the question should be "Please describe the writing instructional program that you think is most appropriate for students in the writing portfolio and the assessment in general. Support that instructional model and transferability to other content areas".

SCAAC member comments:

Suzanne Guyer feels the real issue that we want to look at is where do we want our students to be at the end. She described her three children, all college graduates that are out in the working world. One is an outstanding technical writer. However she would be a terrible literary story or personal narrative writer. Her son has to write in technical, almost like lesson plans. Her other daughter also has to write in a technical writing style begin as short and concise as possible. We are getting into a whole different world and our writing needs to reflect what the needs of our students are. Not every student in life is going to have to be able to write a 20 page literary story. They should be exposed to it in reading and know what it takes to make a good one. But do they need to spend weeks beating the piece up, no.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that the writing domain or content area is no different than the other content areas. When you think about purpose, the purpose of the writing portfolio will be part of that discussion of the writing assessment. If purpose causes us to rethink core content then it is all 7 content areas not just reading or mathematics. We may come to the conclusion that nothing changes. Are we defining the writing instructional program and curriculum the way we want it defined. Are we defining performance standards in the content area the way we want it defined. What kind of assessment is going to support those objectives.

Linda France felt that this is accurate. That is what our discussion has been about and what they will continue to be about. She is intrigued by the discussion this afternoon as these conversations are essential. We have to figure out what the problems are. Is it poorly defined performance standards? Is it poorly orchestrated instruction? What is it that causes these stories to keep surfacing about inappropriate instructional strategies related to portfolio development. To revise a piece of writing 30 times or even 15 times, we do not think this is good practice. How do we get more emphasis on the way of instruction and let writing be an outcome of that. Whether we are reading this wonderful piece of literature and we are doing some kind of reflective piece on what we have read. However we make

those connections we've got to figure this out. If we went around this table it sounds like we are in agreement about the importance of writing. But we are not in agreement on how this is playing out across the state

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton asked the question on what we were being asked to decide. Robert has heard two things discussed with passion. One is the early years. People are very frustrated with that. One is rewriting. One is subject to policy. The other has nothing to do with the portfolio, it has everything to do with instructional practices and lack of administrative control and leadership. If we are not careful we will get the portfolio thrown out. The portfolio could be easily dumped from the whole system.

Kay Freeland suggested to try the survey on a small sample to see what feedback they receive.

Benny Lile supported Eleanor Mills trying the survey in her district to see how it behaves.

KDE staff comments:

Linda France and Scott Trimble are supportive of Eleanor using it in her district as a trial. The other committee members with local district approval are also welcome to use it their districts.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton asked how this conversation might fit into the RFP or has the decision already been made on what will be in the RFP.

H. M. Snodgrass asked Linda France what she wanted to happen with the writing portfolio at grade 4 as this is a big question for consideration in the RFP.

KDE staff comments:

Linda France's indicated that those decisions have not been made at this time. Linda made the observation that it looks like we are really asking a lot of questions about the use of time. There is enough anecdotal evidence that tells us that there is too much time being spent in some of these areas. Should the question be how do we achieve balance in our writing program so that we can gather input from teachers. She thinks that we would all agree that from the stories that we have heard, from the individuals that Linda has talked to personally, there are some inappropriate practices out there. Would this group say because of that let's throw the portfolio out, or is it too soon to tell. Would this group say let's look at achieving balance. She has heard several members mention a technical kind of writing, a piece added, or professional development that possibly would restructure one of the pieces. That really would help us tremendously at this point in time if this issue of balance, instruction practice, and this portfolio is adding too great instruction or poor instruction. If it is adding to poor instruction, how do we bring that back into balance and turn it around.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass asked Linda France and Scott Trimble what they wanted to accomplish with the writing program. And that is what should determine the rest of this.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble indicated that while the time is short, there is time to make legitimate decisions as the RFP development is not scheduled to be completed until the February 2005 time.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile thought he had heard earlier that to meet the Spring 2005 timeline, these decisions needed to be made this fall.

Robert Sexton also raised the issue of the possible need to change regulations and what is the timeline needed if the regulations have to proceed the development of the request for proposal (RFP).

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that he did not believe regulations had to proceed before the RFP as the contract takes affect for the Spring 2007 test administration. The responses to the RFP have to be approved by the State Board and the legislature and we would not make regulation changes unless we had those approvals.

Linda France suggested that when the timeline has been developed that it be provided to Benny Lile for inclusion in the minutes.

6. Writing Portfolio Audit Update
--

Scott Trimble

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble provided a brief writing portfolio audit update. When the data was sent back to districts this year schools were quite concerned about the portfolio audit scores that were changed as a result of the audit. This is the first time that we have done the audit with CTB McGraw Hill. This is also the first time we have done the audit under new design. A number of things were changed that increased the number of high schools selected. The formula for selecting random components also were changed significantly. We advised the audited schools to send the portfolios that they were most concerned about for the Kentucky scoring accuracy team (ScaTT) to review. The team is composed of only Kentucky teachers. They reviewed 600 plus portfolios under reasonably well controlled conditions. The scoring accuracy team agreed with about 70% of the time exactly. 70 to 80% of the time depending on the grade level. The scoring accuracy team was never more than one level off of the audit score. There were some schools where in which there were

some unexplainable inconsistencies. Despite the agreement that Scott just provided, there were very low agreement rates in the specific schools. Because the scoring accuracy team was not able to support the audit scores, those scores lowered by the audit team process we have raised 120 of 200 scores. We will be changing the audit scoring procedure next year. We will use the scoring accuracy team and they will be going to CTB's scoring site in Indianapolis next year to perform these checks. Any time a score is lowered by the audit team the scoring accuracy team will confirm that score should be lowered. That should be about 3000 portfolios.

ADJOURNMENT

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked committee members if there were other items to cover and if not he would entertain a motion for adjournment.

SCAAC MOTION

Maynard Thomas made the motion to adjourn the meeting. H. M. Snodgrass_ seconded the motion. All members in favor of the motion as presented signified by saying aye (all members). All opposed say nay (none). Motion passed and the meeting was officially adjourned at 3:52 p.m.